REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-29 are pending, with Claims 1, 4, 11, 14, 21, 23, and 25 amended by the present amendment.

In the Official Action, Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-16, 18, 19, 21-25, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kester (U.S. Patent No. 7,194,464) in view of Gusler (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,980); Claims 7, 17, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kester and Gusler in view of Maurer et al. ("Hash Table Methods", hereinafter "Maurer"); and Claims 10, 20, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kester and Gusler in view of Willens (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,958).

Claims 1, 11, and 21 are amended to recite features of Claims 4 and 14, albeit with varying language. Claims 1, 4, 11, 14, 21, and 25 are further amended to correct antecedent basis informalities and to recite Applicants' invention in varying language. Support for this amendment is found in Applicants' originally filed specification.[1] No new matter is added.

Briefly recapitulating, amended Claim 11 is directed to:

> A system for restricting access to network accessible digital information by network users of at least one subscriber network, said system comprising:
>
> (a)   a database of restricted location indicators stored at a subscriber network;
>
> (b)   monitoring means at the subscriber network for monitoring requests by the network users of the subscriber network for digital information;
>
> (c)   said monitoring means also determining whether a location indicator associated with each request is in the

---

[1] Specification, paragraphs 0032-0033 and 0035-0037.

database, wherein the monitoring means comprises a network
bridge installed at the subscriber network;

(d)   analysis means at the subscriber network for
initially analysing content of information stored at a location
corresponding to a location indicator not in the database and for
denying or fulfilling the request based on the initial analysis;

(e)   forwarding means at the subscriber network for
periodically forwarding location indicators associated with
requests and not in the database to a remote network node;

(f)   retrieval and analysis means for retrieving by the
remote network node information stored at a location
corresponding to the location indicator forwarded by the
subscriber network and for further analysing a content type of
the retrieved information; and

(g)   dispatching means at the remote network node
for periodically dispatching from the remote node location
indicators found by said further analysis to have restricted type
content stored therein for inclusion in the database of restricted
location indicators maintained at the subscriber network.

Amended Claims 1 and 21 are directed to a method and a computer program product,

each reciting "wherein searching of the database and the initial analysis occur at a network

bridge installed at the subscriber network." The network bridge has the effect of breaking a

local area network into two sub-networks. The bridge therefore routes data (e.g., Ethernet

frames) from a sub-network containing client computers to the other sub-network containing

a proxy server. The bridge has access to a list of restricted URLs, and contains instructions

for performing content analysis algorithms.

In view of the fact that Claims 1, 11, and 21 are amended to recite features of Claims

4, 14, and 25, the outstanding rejections of Claims 1, 11, and 21 is moot. The following

comments are directed to the outstanding rejection of Claims 4, 14, and 25.

Kester describes a system for collecting identifiers for updating a filtering system

which controls access to internet website/pages between a local area network and the internet.

The system of Kester includes a workstation configured for a user to send an identifier to

request an internet website/page and a master database of identifiers along with one or more

categories associated with each identifier. The system also includes a filter system coupled to

the internet gateway system and configured to receive the identifier, determine whether the

identifier is in the master database, send the identifier to a database factory if the identifier is

not in the master database, and apply one or more rules to one or more categories that are

associated with the identifier.

Gusler describes a method for determining dynamic rules for internet protocol

addresses which should be inaccessible from an organization. In Gusler, keywords are

entered into a search table. A sliding scale is established, wherein a term may be awarded a

point value based upon its severity. Subsequently, a keyword's frequency in point value are

used to determine the acceptability of a document source. An organizational policy may be

established based upon the total number of points per document served from an internet

protocol address or an average point value for documents served from an internet protocol

address with respect to a threshold.

In rejecting Claims 4 and 14, the Official Action asserts that Kester discloses

searching a database and performing initial content analysis at an Ethernet bridge installed at

a subscriber network. To support this assertion, the Official Action points to column 3, lines

21-49, of Kester. This portion of Kester describes that the internet gateway system 105

couples the LAN 100 and the internet 104. Kester notes that internet gateway systems are

well known in the art and normally communicate through connection devices, such as routers

or other data packet switching technology, for transmitting internet TCP/IP protocols into the

proper protocols for communicating with the internet 104. The internet gateway system 105

used to implement a given system can vary as well as its location within the LAN 100. For

example, internet gateway system 105 could be located at the workstation(s) 102 or

connected peripherally to the internet 104. The internet gateway system 105 illustrated in

Figure 1 includes a firewall module 106 coupled to a router module 108.

Applicants traverse the finding that Kester describes a monitoring means that includes

a network bridge installed at the subscriber network as recited in Claim 11, or searching of

the database and the initial analysis occur at a network bridge installed at the subscriber

network as recited in Claims 1 and 21. Kester describes an internet filter which is based on

firewall server or proxy server topologies, which traditionally operate at ISO layers 5 and 6.

In contrast, Applicants' claimed invention includes a network bridge which operates at ISO

layer 2. Furthermore, contrary to the Official Action, the portion of Kester cited in the

rejection of Claims 4 and 14 does not disclose or suggest searching or performing initial

content analysis at a network bridge installed at a subscriber network. In fact, the cited

portion of Kester does not mention searching at all.

Applicants have considered Gusler, and submit that Gusler does not cure the

deficiencies of Kester. Gusler is concerned with dynamic modification of internet firewalls,

again typically operating at ISO layers 5/6. The bridges mentioned in Gusler are PCI or bus

bridges which relate to the internal architecture of a computing device. Such internal PCI or

bus bridges are concerned with interconnection of system buses and the like, and are not

network bridges as recited in Applicants' amended Claims 1, 11, and 21. Furthermore,

Gusler does not disclose or suggest searching or performing initial content analysis at a

network bridge installed at a subscriber network.

As none of the cited prior art, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests all

the elements of independent Claims 1, 11, and 21, Applicants submit the inventions defined

by Claims 1, 11, and 21, and all claims depending therefrom, are not rendered obvious by the

asserted references for at least the reasons stated above.[2]

Accordingly, in view of the present amendment and in light of the previous

discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for

allowance and respectfully request an early and favorable action to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Michael E. Monaco
Registration No. 52,041

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\MM\304122US-AM.DOC

---

[2] MPEP § 2142 "...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest **all** the claim limitations.